



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/191,757

11/13/98

VAIDYANATHAN

S

777.174US1

021186

WM02/0222

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH
P.O. BOX 2938
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402

EXAMINER

KHATRI, A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2122

DATE MAILED:

02/22/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/191,757

Applicant(s)

VAIDYANATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Anil Khatri

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 1998.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 14) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 15) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 16) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 17) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 18) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 19) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2122

DETAILED ACTION

1. It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior copending Application No. ***, and filed ***. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence of the specification of this application if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120. See 37 CFR 1.78(a). Also, the current status of all non-provisional parent applications referenced should be included.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: "Automated Help System for Reference Information".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-4, 15, 22 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Potts et al. U.S. Patent no. 5,627,958.

Art Unit: 2122

Regarding claim 1

Potts et al. teaches,

- an editor to provide for developing source code for a computer program source code including an identifier (see figure 2, column 3, line 42, “user interaction typically provided by the tutorial writer within the script”, line 47, “the script writer”, column 17, line 62, “scripts are written in a simple language”);
- an automatic help module invoked upon predetermined event and operative to display information associated with the identifier (see figure 3, column 4, line 3, “a help information continuum for providing on demand”, line 10, “continuum interface for automatically providing help and tutorial information”)

Regarding claim 2

Potts et al. teaches,

- the identifier is a function name, macro name or template name (column 63, line 20, “function name (parameter)”, and line 40, “#define replacementtext..”)

Regarding claim 3

Potts et al. teaches,

- identifier is an attribute name (column 5, line 9, “object property: an attribute or other data associated with particular object”)

Regarding claim 4

Potts et al. teaches,

Art Unit: 2122

- the reference information is displayed with tooltip box (column 5, line 14, “object which displays information to the user”).

Regarding claim 15

Potts et al. teaches,

- developing at least a section of source code for a computer program source code including an identifier (see figure 2, column 3, line 42, “user interaction typically provided by the tutorial writer within the script”, line 47, “the script writer”, column 17, line 62, “scripts are written in a simple language”);

- detecting an event (column 7, line 24, “an event driven architecture 250 eschews a pre-selected sequence opting instead for an event loop, the event loop 260 is a centralized mechanism for processing message about user and system events”)

- searching for information on the identifier in response to the event (column 7, line 28, “it includes an event queues 270 and mechanism for retrieving 263 and dispatching”)

- displaying the information (see figure 1A, column 5, line 14, “object which displays information to the user”).

Regarding claim 22

Potts et al teaches,

- a processor (figure 1 A)

- a computer readable medium (column 5, line 44, “main memory”)

- an editor to provide for developing source code for a computer program source code including an identifier (see figure 2, column 3, line 42, “user interaction typically provided by the tutorial

Art Unit: 2122

writer within the script", line 47, "the script writer", column 17, line 62, "scripts are written in a simple language");

- an automatic help module invoked upon predetermined event and operative to display information associated with the identifier (see figure 3, column 4, line 3, "a help information continuum for providing on demand", line 10, "continuum interface for automatically providing help and tutorial information").

Regarding claim 32

Rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and further claim 32 recites limitation as in claim 15, therefore, claim 32 is rejected under same rationale as claim 15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5-14, 16-21, 23-31 and 33-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Potts et al.* U.S. Patent no. 5,627,958 taken with *Hobson et al.* U.S. Patent no. 5,694,559.

Regarding claim 5

Potts et al. teaches,

Art Unit: 2122

- a database module (see figure 1 A, column 5, line 34, “including database management system”, column 5, line 19, “a collection of statements which are understood by the script engine) but does not explicitly teaches operative to supply at least subset of information when queried by the automated help module. However, *Hobson et al* teaches,

- operative to supply at least subset of information when queried by the automated help module (column 1, line 41, “the free text query system described perform partial analysis includes identifying keywords within input provided by the user”). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have on line help system with text query scheme in modifying help system for computer based training help. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine automated help system with utilizing free text query mechanism in order to produce automated help system for information system to make system user friendly.

Regarding claim 6

Hobson et al. teaches,

- the database module a pre-created database and dynamically updated database (see figure 2, column 7, line 61, access the database 206 invokes the language DLL”), pre created database and dynamically update database containing reference information on a plurality of entries (column 8, line 37, “data types are words that a user may use to refer to each topic”) and automatic help module queries pre created database and dynamically updated data to obtain reference information on an entity matching the identifier (column 9, line 28, “database 206 stores records of all of the previously describe data type”, column 11, line 52, “database record are then run

Art Unit: 2122

through an automated process that creates database records containing inflected forms of the words”, line 59, “a second query is then performed on the inflected form of the word to determine if it matches the context word”)

Regarding claim 7

Potts et al. teaches,

- a parser operative to parse the source code and to obtain data for the identifier (see figure 3, column 17, line 51, “script engine processes the message according to the instruction of the script (i.e. effects the action desired by the script writer as indicated by the use of matching reserve words, column 18, line 66, preferred script syntax are appended herewith as appendix E)

Regarding claim 8

Potts et al. teaches,

- the parsed data includes a data type for the identifier (column 8, line 37, “data types are words that a user may use to refer to each topic”)

Regarding claim 9

Potts et al. teaches,

- the parsed data includes a class specifier for the identifier (column 19, line 20, “the Eventinfo class hierarchy 550 includes nine derived Eventinfo classes”)

Regarding claim 10

Hobson et al. teaches,

- comment search module operative to scan a set of source code comment associated with the identifier and the reference information displayed the code comment (see figure 4)

Art Unit: 2122

Regarding claim 11

Potts et al. teaches,

- reference information comprises a parameter list for function identified by the function name (column 20, line 27, “the windows showwindow() function winselectinfo contains the name of the selected menu or control window”)

Regarding claim 12

Hobson et al. teaches,

- required parameter is highlighted within reference information (see figure 4)

Regarding claim 13

Potts et al. teaches,

- the predetermined event occurs when a cursor is positioned over the identifier (column 13, line 3, “setcursor_dispatch method 500 is invoked whenever a sercursor message is trapped by the ATU (captured by a hook function before the event has been received by the application)

Regarding claim 14

Potts et al. teaches,

- the predetermined event occurs when the identifier is entered into a source code (column 7, line 24, “an event driven architecture 250 eschews a pre-selected sequence opting instead for an event loop”, line 45, “simply a data structure containing information about a particular event”).

Regarding claim 16

Rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and further claim 16 recites limitation as in claim 14, therefore, claim 16 is rejected under same rationale as claim 14.

Art Unit: 2122

Regarding claim 17

Rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and further claim 17 recites limitation as in claim 13, therefore, claim 17 is rejected under same rationale as claim 13.

Regarding claim 18

Hobson et al teaches,

- searching for information includes searching a database information (see figure 5, column 7, line 61, access the database 206 invokes the language DLL")

Regarding claim 19

Hobson et al teaches,

- searching for information includes searching a source file for comments associated with the identifier (see figures 5 and 6 A, column 7, line 61, access the database 206 invokes the language DLL" column 12, line 28, "all sentence variations have been found")

Regarding claim 20

Rejection of claim 15 is incorporated and further claim 20 recites limitation as in claim 4, therefore, claim 20 is rejected under same rationale as claim 4.

Regarding claim 21

Potts et al teaches,

- searching for information includes dynamically parsing the section of source code to provide parsed data and using a subset of the parsed data as a search parameter (see figure 3, column 17, line 51, "script engine processes the message according to the instruction of the script (i.e. effects

Art Unit: 2122

the action desired by the script writer as indicated by the sue of matching reserve words, column 18, line 66, preferred script syntax are append

Regarding claim 23

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 23 recites limitation as in claim 2, therefore, claim 23 is rejected under same rationale as claim 2.

Regarding claim 24

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 24 recites limitation as in claim 3, therefore, claim 23 is rejected under same rationale as claim 3.

Regarding claim 25

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 25 recites limitation as in claim 4, therefore, claim 25 is rejected under same rationale as claim 4.

Regarding claim 26

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 26 recites limitation as in claim 6, therefore, claim 26 is rejected under same rationale as claim 6.

Regarding claim 27

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 27 recites limitation as in claim 6, therefore, claim 26 is rejected under same rationale as claim 6.

Regarding claim 28

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 28 recites limitation as in claim 7, therefore, claim 28 is rejected under same rationale as claim 7.

Art Unit: 2122

Regarding claim 29

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 29 recites limitation as in claim 9, therefore, claim 29 is rejected under same rationale as claim 9.

Regarding claim 30

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 30 recites limitation as in claim 9, therefore, claim 30 is rejected under same rationale as claim 9.

Regarding claim 31

Rejection of claim 22 is incorporated and further claim 31 recites limitation as in claim 11, therefore, claim 31 is rejected under same rationale as claim 11.

Regarding claim 33

Rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further claim 33 recites limitation as in claim 14, therefore, claim 33 is rejected under same rationale as claim 14.

Regarding claim 34

Potts et al teaches,

- event comprises entering a separator token into source code (column 10, line 9, "script 320 is pre-tokenized whereby source listing and comments are stored")

Regarding claim 35

Rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further claim 35 recites limitation as in claim 13, therefore, claim 35 is rejected under same rationale as claim 13.

Art Unit: 2122

Regarding claim 36

Rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further claim 36 recites limitation as in claim 18, therefore, claim 36 is rejected under same rationale as claim 18.

Regarding claim 37

Rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further claim 37 recites limitation as in claim 19, therefore, claim 37 is rejected under same rationale as claim 19.

Regarding claim 38

Rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further claim 38 recites limitation as in claim 4, therefore, claim 38 is rejected under same rationale as claim 4.

Regarding claim 39

Rejection of claim 32 is incorporated and further claim 39 recites limitation as in claim 21, therefore, claim 39 is rejected under same rationale as claim 21.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Wolf et al teaches application control module for common user access interface.
- Tuniman et al teaches method and system for stacking toolbars in a computer display.

Art Unit: 2122

- Coleman et al teaches method and apparatus for displaying and scrolling data in a window based graphics user interface.
- Palmer et al teaches method and apparatus or providing help based window system using multiple access methods.
- McDonald et al teaches man/machine interface graphical code generation wizard for automatically creating MMI graphical programs.
- Nagel teaches object code logic analysis and automated modification system and method.
- Franke et al teaches authoring Hypertext Unix help manual.
- Sukaviriya et al teaches automatic generation of textual, audio and animated help in UIDE: the user interface design environment.
- Paterno teaches automatic generation of task oriented help.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil Khatri whose telephone number is (703) 305-0282. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-5:00 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Mark Powell can be reached on (703) 305-9703.

Art Unit: 2122

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Anil Khatri', with a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Anil Khatri
Patent Examiner

February 2, 2001